



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,909	10/25/2007	Stephen Doyle	EIP26.001APC	2475
20995	7590	10/29/2010	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP				YANG, I CHAN
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
efiling@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/588,909	DOYLE, STEPHEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	I-CHAN YANG	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/08/07</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the following communications: application filed on 10/25/2007, of which Claims 1-18 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/08/2007 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not in narrative form and repeat the legal phraseology in the claim language of Claim 1. Appropriate correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10, 12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hwang et al. (Gwo-Jen Hwang, Judy C.R. Tseng, and Yu-San Huang, “I-WAP: An Intelligent WAP Site Management System, April-June 2002, IEEE, IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing, Vol 1, No 2, hereinafter, Hwang)*.

As per Claim 1: *Hwang discloses a method of providing content to be presented on a terminal (Page 82, §1 Introduction, ¶1, providing content and services with WML on portable devices), said method comprising:*

taking as an input a first document in a first document language, the first document language using markup tags to define elements of the document, said first document language including a first set of element types (Page 83, §2 Relevant Research, Table 5, HTML is the first document markup language, with a first set of element types),

translating the first document into a second document in a second document language, the second document language using markup tags, text or document codings to define elements of the second document, said second document language including a second set of element types (Page 83, §2 Relevant Research, Table 5, WML is the second document markup language, with a second set of element types) ,

wherein the first set of element types includes a first element type, for which an equivalent element type is not present in said second set, and wherein the first document includes a section including said first element type and at least one attribute of the element type (Page 87, §4.2 Content Reorganization Algorithm, HTML TABLE, FRAME, and FORM do not have equivalent translations in WML; Fig. 5, HTML document containing a table, the table have associated attributes such as rows, columns, and the data within the rows and columns),

the method comprising processing said first section in the first document, and generating a corresponding second section in said second document, said second

section including a second element type (Fig. 5, Fig. 6, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, translating the table into a set of options in the WML document), wherein one of said first section and said second section includes two separate subsections which each include one or more attributes corresponding to one or more attributes of said second or said first element type, respectively (Fig. 5, Fig. 6, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, the WML translation includes a plurality of options and sub-options, each corresponding to a cell of a particular row and column in the original HTML table).

As per Claim 2: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said two separate subsections are at the same level of hierarchy in said document (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, a HTML table without column or row title is translated as a plurality of options in the same hierarchical level).*

As per Claim 3 *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said two different subsections are at different levels of hierarchy in said document (Fig. 6, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, a HTML table with more than 2 columns is translated with the column titles as options at the first level, the row titles as options at the second level, and the cell data as options at the third level).*

As per Claim 4: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 3, wherein said second section includes two or more separate subsections which each include one or more*

attributes corresponding to one or more attributes of said first element type (Fig. 6, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, the options at the second level of the WML document corresponds to the row titles in the HTML document).

As per Claim 5: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 4, wherein said second section includes two or more separate subsections which each include the same attribute, said same attribute corresponding to an attribute of the first element type (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, each link option in the translated WML document correspond to a link in the untitled HTML table).*

As per Claim 6: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 5, wherein said first section includes a first subsection including a template element and a plurality of further subsections defining parts of a document to be presented separately on the user terminal (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, a HTML table is a template with a plurality of separately presented subsections/cells).*

As per Claim 7: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 6, wherein said second section includes a plurality of equivalent subsections corresponding to each of said further subsections, said equivalent subsections each including the same attribute, said same attribute corresponding to an attribute of said template element (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, translated WML page have a list of options, the options*

preserve the link attribute corresponding to the hyperlinks found within the cells of the original HTML table).

As per Claim 8: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 7, wherein said template element type has a hyperlink attribute defined therein, and wherein said same attribute is a corresponding hyperlink attribute (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, each entry in the original HTML table are hyperlinks; each option in the translated WML page are links).*

As per Claim 9: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 4, wherein the wherein said second section includes two separate subsections which each include one or more different attributes, said different attributes each corresponding to at least one attribute of said first element type (Fig. 9, Page 90, §5.3 Form Documents, HTML form translated as a plurality of subsections in WML, such as form field title and editing options; the different subsections include attributes that correspond to the attribute in the original HTML form, such as INPUT to TEXT).*

As per Claim 10: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 9, wherein said first element type is a form element type (Fig. 9, Page 90, §5.3 Form Documents, original document includes a HTML form).*

As per Claim 12: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein said two separate subsections are in the first document and the second document includes one section which is equivalent to one of the two separate subsections (Fig. 7, Page 89, §5.1 Tabular Documents, the columns and rows in a untitled HTML table are translated as one flat section/list in WML).*

As per Claim 17: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein the generation of a second document is partitioned into sections to enable operation with devices with limited bandwidth connections or memory limitations (§1 Introduction, ¶3; §4.2 Content Reorganization Algorithm, Fig. 5, Fig. 6, HTML table is partitioned into several WML documents).*

As per Claim 18: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 17, where there is generation of navigational elements allowing a user to select different sections of the equivalent of the first document (Fig. 5, Fig. 6, §5.1 Tabular Documents, WML options are navigational elements to navigate between the different levels of WML documents).*

Claim 1 and 13 are (further) rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being obvious over *Filner et al. (US 2004/0255244, hereinafter, Filner)*.

As per Claim 1: *Filner discloses a method of providing content to be presented on a terminal ([0002]), said method comprising:*

taking as an input a first document in a first document language, the first document language using markup tags to define elements of the document, said first document language including a first set of element types ([0013], received content in HTML),

translating the first document into a second document in a second document language, the second document language using markup tags, text or document codings to define elements of the second document, said second document language including a second set of element types ([0013], converted content to CSS),

wherein the first set of element types includes a first element type, for which an equivalent element type is not present in said second set, and wherein the first document includes a section including said first element type and at least one attribute of the element type ([0013], [0038], HTML elements such as vspace and hspace have no equivalent element in CSS, “equivalent” here denotes one-to-one correspondence),

the method comprising processing said first section in the first document, and generating a corresponding second section in said second document, said second section including a second element type ([0013], converting part of HTML to CSS),

wherein one of said first section and said second section includes two separate subsections which each include one or more attributes corresponding to one or more attributes of said second or said first element type, respectively ([0038], the HTML vspace element is translated as two subsections: margin-top and margin-bottom in CSS).

As per Claim 13: *Filner discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein the first set of element types includes attributes which do not exist in the second set of element types and wherein the translation is conducted using equivalent expressions using Cascading Style Sheet attributes ([0013], [0038] correspondence table, translating HTML styling elements and attributes into equivalent CSS expressions).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Hwang* in view of the Examiner's Official Notice.

As per Claim 11: *Hwang discloses a method according to claim 10, wherein said two separate subsections of said second section include a first subsection in which the presentation of input data fields is defined (Hwang, Fig. 9, name and email fields presented in WML).*

Hwang does not appear to explicitly disclose

a second subsection in which an action is defined whereby the data collected in said input data fields is sent a server.

However, the examiner takes Official Notice that at the time of the invention, it is common knowledge to use a form for gathering user information and send the gathered information to a server.

As *Hwang* discloses a HTML form translated into WML, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to include subsections within the translated WML in which an action is defined to send the gathered data to a server. The motivation for doing so would have been to preserve the purpose and usability of the original form in WML.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Filner* in view of *Richard* (US 2002/0073119).

As per Claims 14 and 15: *Filner* does not appear to explicitly disclose
wherein the first set of element types includes attributes containing Cascading Style Sheet expressions which do not exist in the second set of element attributes and wherein the translation is conducted using equivalent expression using elements and attributes.

However, *Filner* discloses the correspondence between CSS expressions and HTML elements and attributes (*Filner*, [0038]). And *Richard* discloses converting an input document in any of a plurality of markup formats to an output document in any of a plurality of markup formats (*Richard*, Fig. 2, [0015]).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to convert the HTML-equivalent CSS expressions disclosed in *Filner* back to HTML elements and attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to reuse existing web documents by converting from one markup format to another to accommodate different browsing platforms (*Richard*, [0013]), such as platforms that do not support CSS.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over *Hwang* in view of *Lue* (US 2004/0148571).

As per Claim 16: *Hwang* does not appear to explicitly disclose
wherein the first set of element types, attributes and document content is converted to a second set of element types, attributes and document content according to specific real-time and pre-determinable capabilities of that device.

However, *Lue* discloses

wherein the first set of element types, attributes and document content is converted to a second set of element types, attributes and document content according to specific real-time and pre-determinable capabilities of that device (Fig. 1, step 26-32, [0014], [0016], lines 25-31).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to transcode HTML into WML based on the real-time rendering/network capacity of the display device. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide real-time accommodation for the specific target display device (*Lue*, [0008], [0015]).

References

All prior art made of record in this Office Action or as cited on form PTO-892 notwithstanding being relied upon, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Therefore, applicant is required under 37 CFR 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this Office Action.

- US 2003/0018668 structured document transcoding with annotation
- US 2003/0093756 conversion of XML to HTML
- US 2004/0205650 dynamic web content unfolding for wireless device
- US 2005/0021851 forms on smartphones
- US 2005/0050000 XSLT stylesheets for different portable devices
- US 2006/0031759 providing browser function on a web page

- US 6,023,714 adapting document layout to output device
- US 6,535,896 converting HTML for pervasive computing devices
- US 6,857,102 document re-authoring method
- US 7,143,342 condense HTML for PDA
- US 7,337,392 adapting web content to different display dimensions
- US 7,434,158 presenting multimodal web page content
- US 7,441,196 manipulating a region on a wireless display
- US 7,461,353 scalable display of web content on mobile devices
- US 7,496,838 converting markup language files
- US 7,500,188 adapting content for an electronic device
- US 7,565,605 reorganizing content of an electronic document
- US 7,584,423 full-page web browsing on hand-held devices
- US 7,644,400 delivering content to mobile devices
- US 7,703,009 XSL designs using meta-tag information
- US 7,797,447 creating links from web content for mobile devices

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I-Chan Yang whose telephone number is (571) 270-3840. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

/I. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2178